PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

rec'd	2	8	FEB	2005	
WIPO		i Tarrier	······································	PCT	•

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

		icle 36 and Rule 70).	•
Applicant's or agent's file referen	FOR FURTHE	R ACTION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416
International application No. PCT/AU2004/000407	31 March 2004		Priority date (day/month/year) 31 March 2003
International Patent Classification	(IPC) or national classifica	tion and IPC	
Int. Cl. 7 G01N 35/00.			
Applicant			
VISION BIOSYSTEMS	LIMITED et al		
		•	
1 This report is the interest in			
Authority under Article 35 and	preliminary examination rep	ort, established by this Inter	mational Preliminary Examining
2. This REPORT consists of a tot			
3. This report is also accompanied	d by ANNEXES comprising	us cover sheet.	
a. (sent to the applicant of	and to the International Bure		
<u> </u>		-	
sheets of the desc sheets containing Administrative In	ription, claims and/or drawing rectifications authorized by structions).	ngs which have been amend this Authority (see Rule 70.	ed and are the basis for this report and/or 16 and Section 607 of the
sheets which supe	rsede earlier chaota but		•
the disclosure in t Box.	he international application a	on this Authority considers as filed, as indicated in item	contain an amendment that goes beyond 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental
Relating to Sequence L	al Bureau only) a total of (incortable related thereto, in consisting (see Section 802 of the	Administration I	lectronic carrier(s)) , containing as indicated in the Supplemental Box s).
Table 20 and and and anons	relating to the following ite	ms:	
	he report		
Box No. II Priority		•	
X Box No. III Non-estab	lishment of opinion with reg	gard to novelty, inventive sto	ep and industrial applicability
Lack of the	nity of invention		- Approximity
	statement under Article 35(2 nd explanations supporting s	?) with regard to novelty, in such statement	ventive step or industrial applicability;
A Box No. VI Certain do	cuments cited		
Box No. VII Certain de	fects in the international app	lication	·
137 75 55	servations on the internation		
Date of submission of the demand			
23 December 2004		Date of completion of the	report
lame and mailing address of the IPEA/A		18 February 2005	
USTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE		Authorized Officer	
O BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AU-mail address: pct@ipaustralia.gov.au	STRALIA	DA DODKI S	
acsimile No. (02) 6285 3929		RAJEEV DESHMUK	
		Telephone No. (02) 6283	2145

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/000407

Box No. I Basis of the report	1 C1/AU2004/00040/
1. With regard to the language, this report is based on the interest in the in	
1. With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language otherwise indicated under this item.	
This report is based on translations from the original language into the following lang which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:	uage , ,
international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1 (b))	
publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)	
international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)	
furnished to the elements of the international application, this report is based on (replace filed" and are not annexed to this report):	ment sheets which have been o in this report as "originally
the international application as originally filed/furnished	• •
the description:	
pages as originally filed/furnished	
pages* received by this Authority on with the letter of	
pages* received by this Authority on with the letter of the claims:	
pages as originally filed/furnished	
pages* as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19	•
pages* received by this Authority on with the letter of	9
pages* received by this Authority on with the letter of	
the drawings:	
pages as originally filed/furnished	·
pages* received by this Authority on with the letter of	
pages* received by this Authority on with the letter of	
a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequen	ice Listing.
The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:	
the description, pages	
the claims, Nos.	
the drawings, sheets/figs	·
the sequence listing (specify):	
any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify):	
This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report an made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in 70.2(c)).	nd listed below had not been n the Supplemental Box (Rule
the description, pages	
the claims, Nos.	
the drawings, sheets/figs	
the sequence listing (specify):	
any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify):	
If item 4 applies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."	
superseuea.	

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/000407

	ne questions whether the claimed invention or the state of the state o
in	ne questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be dustrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:
L	the entire international application
[2	claims Nos: 14
Ъ	ecause:
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos.
	relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):
	- State Processing Community Communi
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos.
	are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):
	•
	the claims, or said claims Nos.
X	are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
	are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. no international search report has been established for said claim Nos. 14 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not correly with the sequence of the sequence
]	are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. no international search report has been established for said claim Nos. 14 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:
]	are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. no international search report has been established for said claim Nos. 14 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that: he written form has not been furnished
_] t	are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. no international search report has been established for said claim Nos. 14 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that: he written form
_ _ t	are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. no international search report has been established for said claim Nos. 14 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that: he written form has not been furnished
_] t	are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. no international search report has been established for said claim Nos. 14 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that: he written form
# 7	are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed. no international search report has been established for said claim Nos. 14 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that: he written form

International application No.

	PC1/AU2004/000407
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention	
1. In response to the invitation to restrict or pay additional to	fees the applicant has:
restricted the claims.	
paid additional fees.	
paid additional fees under protest.	
neither restricted nor paid additional fees.	
	ention is not complied with and chose, according to Rule 68.1,
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of inventi	ion in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is:
complied with.	15.5 IS.
X not complied with for the following reasons:	·
Please see the Supplemental Sheet.	
	·
·	
	•
·	
Consequently, this report has been astablished.	
Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the foll	lowing parts of the international application:
all parts. X the parts relating to claims Nos. 1–13	·

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/000407

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: Box IV

The international application does not comply with the requirements of unity of invention because it does not relate to an invention or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a general inventive concept. In coming to this conclusion, the International Searching Authority has found that there are three inventions:

Claim 1: A method of preparing a blended reagent in an automated biological reaction apparatus including: ascertaining a blended reagent is required, preparing the blended reagent before its application is required. It is considered that " ascertaining a blended reagent is required, preparing the blended reagent before its application is required " comprises a first "special technical feature".

Claim 8: A method scheduling application of reagent to a number of slides in an automated biological reaction apparatus including: grouping at least one group of slides together as a batch, ascertaining whether a blended reagent is to be applied to any slide within the batch, and scheduling the step of preparing the blended reagent before the step of applying the blended reagent to the slide. It is considered that "grouping at least one group of slides together as a batch, ascertaining whether a blended reagent is to be applied to any slide within the batch, and scheduling the step of preparing the blended reagent before the step of applying the blended reagent to the slide".

Claim 13: An automated biological reaction apparatus having a mixing vessel, reagent containers, a robotic arm having a dispenser for dispensing fluid from reagent containers to slides or mixing vials, a mixing vial and a controlling computer. It is considered that "a mixing vessel, reagent containers, a robotic arm having a dispenser for dispensing fluid from reagent containers to slides or mixing vials, a mixing vial and a controlling computer" comprises a third "special technical feature".

Claim 14: A mixing vial having a mount, a plurality of mixing chambers, and an identification means. It is considered that " a mixing vial having a mount, a plurality of mixing chambers, and an identification means " comprises a fourth "special technical feature".

Since the abovementioned groups of claims do not share any of the special technical features identified, a "technical relationship" among the inventions—as defined in PCT Rule 13.2—does not exist. Accordingly the international application does not relate to a single invention or to a single general inventive concept. It was however considered that the first and the second inventions could be searched together with little additional effort, no additional fee is being requested for the second invention.

As the search for the third and the fourth invention would have required more than a little additional search effort over that for the first and the second invention, additional search fees were warranted.

In response to the invitation to pay additional fees, the applicant paid an additional search fee in respect of claim 13. Consequently claim 14 was not subjected to an international search and therefore no international search report—and no written opinion of the international searching authority—has been established in respect of claim 14.

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/000407

l _		
Box No. V	December	
204 110. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive s and explanations supporting such statement	
aitatia	with regard to novelty, inventive	stan or industrial and the true
[спацоп	s and explanations supporting such etata-	sich or minastriat abblicabilita:
	s and explanations supporting such statement	

 Statement 	t
-------------------------------	---

Novelty (N)		
11010119 (11)	Claims	YES
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 1–13	NO
mvonuve step (15)	Claims	YES
Industrial and the second	Claims 1–13	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1–13	YES
ons and explanations (D. 1. 50 m)	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

US 2002/0090730 A1 (ECKERT et al.) 11 July 2002.

US 2002/0072122 A1 (COPELAND et al.) 13 June 2002.

US 6349264 B1 (RHETT et al.) 19 February 2002.

US 5609822 A (CAREY et al.) 11 March 1997.

EP 485816 A2 (GRUPO GRIFOLS S.A.) 20 May 1992.

US 4678752 A (THORNE et al.) 7 July 1987.

WO 2001/051909 A1 (LAB VISION CORPORATION) 19 July 2001.

NOVELTY (N), INVENTIVE STEP (IS) CLAIMS 1-13

THORNE discloses that the transfer of liquids from reservoir 78 into the different receptacles facilitates the mixing of the sample liquid and any liquid reagents originally included in one or more receptacles of the reagent package to thereby form one or more reaction mixtures for subsequent analysis. In light of THORNE the claimed invention does not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step.

The remaining documents do not disclose the step of blending reagents in an automated biological reaction apparatus. These documents disclose that the reagents are supplied either from the bulk containers or from reagent packs containing pre-packaged reagents. However if a particular reaction needs a blended reagent, a person skilled in the art would find it obvious to provide for the mixing step—and this would not involve overcoming any technical difficulties or require inventive ingenuity, as the step of preparing the blended reagent before it is required is technically trivial. Consequently claims 1–13 do not appear to involve an inventive step in light of any of the cited documents, or alternatively in light of the obvious combination of any of the cited documents with THORNE.

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/000407

ROY NO VII O	ts cited		
Box No. VI Certain documen			
. Certain published documents (Ru	ule 70.10)		
Application No:	Publication date	Filing date	75 to the state of
Patent No.	(day/month/year)	(day/month/year)	Priority date (valid clain (day/month/year)
WO 2004/001390 A1	31 December 2003	20 June 2003	20 June 2002
			20 June 2002
,		•	
•		,	,
	•		
	•		
7 2004/001200 A1 GEGGGGGG		,	
O 2004/001390 A1 (VISION BI sent application because the pri- ority documents for WO 2004/0	ority document for the pres	sent application (ATI 2003)	11871) is one of the
ority documents for WO 2004/0 earlier priority date. Page 15, li	01390. However WO 200	4/001390 also claims priorit	by from AII PS3114 which 1
earlier priority date. Page 15, line priority claim of WO 2004/001	ne 18-page 16, line 24 des	cribe essentially what is cla	imed in present claims 1_13
priority claim of WO 2004/001	1390 in relation to AU PS3	114 in relation to this disclo	osure has not been verified.
•	•		and the state of t
•			•
Non-written disclosures (Rule 70.9)		
Non-written disclosures (Rule 70.9)		
)	·	· ·
Non-written disclosures (Rule 70.9) Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte	en disclosure	Date of written disclosure
		<i>,</i> .	Pate of written disclosure ing to non-written disclosure
	Date of non-writte	<i>,</i> .	Pate of written disclosure ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
	Date of non-writte	<i>,</i> .	ing to non-written disclosure
	Date of non-writte	<i>,</i> .	ing to non-written disclosure
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month)	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month)	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month)	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month)	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month)	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month)	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-writte (day/month)	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
	Date of non-writte (day/month)	/year) referr	ing to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/000407

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

- 1. The applicant is invited to insert into the specification references to the prior art cited in the international search report and to discuss the invention in relation to the prior art so as to put the invention into proper perspective.
- 2. The independent claims have been drafted in such a manner that it is not clear what inventive contribution these claims make over the prior art. The two-part claim format in the PCT Rules may be more appropriate.
- 3. The claims are not clear. For example claim 13 lists a number of technical features but does not define any interrelationship between these features. Claim 1 has the method step of "preparing the blended reagent before its application is required"—this appears to be stating the obvious. Certainly it would be of no use preparing the blended reagent after its application was required.